

## REMARKS

Claims 1 through 10 are in the application, with Claims 1 and 5-10 having been amended, and with Claims 11-19 having been cancelled. Claims 1 and 5 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 1-6 are rejected as being anticipated by Ferstenberg et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,873,071 (hereinafter “Ferstenberg”).

Claim 1, as now presented, is directed to a “method for transaction management and processing in a trading environment”. The claimed method includes “providing an Order Management System for receiving Orders” and “processing Orders, by way of said Order Management System”. Claim 1 further recites that the processing of Orders further includes “providing each of the Orders with a respective session” and “providing Orders from an Order Management System to an Exchange”. In addition, the processing of Orders also includes “providing transaction information for Orders from an Exchange to an Order Management System”. Still further, claim 1 specifies that “said Order Management System comprises components selected from the group comprising: at least two cooperating services, in-memory cache, and client API”.

It is noted that as now presented claim 1 has been amended to recite the additional method step of “providing each of the Orders with a respective session”. Support for this amendment is found at page 9, lines 12-13 of the specification. As explained in the specification, providing a session for each order aids in overall stability and verification of the order.

This newly-recited feature of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the Ferstenberg reference. Ferstenberg, at column 42, lines 5-10, discloses exchanging electronic messages, including orders, between clients and an “OM” (Order Manager) system. However, Ferstenberg does not teach that each order is to be provided with a respective session. It is therefore

respectfully submitted that this amendment of claim 1 has overcome the rejection thereof, and that the rejection accordingly should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is noted that the only other independent claim, which is claim 5, has now been clarifyingly amended such that the above remarks made with respect to claim 1 concerning provision of a respective session for each order are also applicable with respect to claim 5. Thus, claim 5 is submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 1. The other pending claims, all being dependent claims, are also submitted as patentable on the same basis. It is not believed that the pending rejection of dependent claims under § 103(a) raises any issues that require further discussion.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

May 2, 2006  
Date



Nathaniel Levin  
Registration No. 34,860  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Five Elm Street  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-3460